

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION VIA EFS-WEB

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via EFS-Web to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on September 4, 2009.

/Palak Bhakta/
Palak Bhakta

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants: Thomas Pun, et al.

Application No.: 10/716,265

Filed: 11/17/2003

Title: METHOD FOR IMPLEMENTING
AN IMPROVED QUANTIZER IN A
MULTIMEDIA COMPRESSION
AND ENCODING SYSTEM

Art Unit: 2621

Examiner:
WERNER, DAVID N

APPLICANTS' STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Applicants' representatives had a telephonic interview with Examiner David Werner on August 11, 2009. Applicants' representatives, Ali Makoui and Palak Bhakta, participated in the interview.

During the interview, Applicants' representative discussed the pending claims of the current application with Examiner Werner. Applicants' representatives specifically showed that certain elements are not shown in the cited references. For instance, none of the cited references show using a number of actual bits used in a previous frame to compute a delta value that is used for computing a quantizer adjustment. Examiner Werner agreed with Applicants' representatives that such a limitation is not disclosed and that it would be improper to combine Chiang and Peak because it would require one to equate an estimated bit quantity to actual bits used for a particular frame.

Applicants' representatives also stated that the combination of Chiang and Lee does not disclose a buffer occupancy accumulator recited in claim 1. Specifically, Applicants' representatives discussed that the cited section of Lee does not disclose calculating a buffer occupancy accumulator. Instead, Lee discusses calculation of a target bit count. Applicants' representatives submitted that combining the calculation for buffer fullness of Chiang and the calculation for a target bit budget in Lee does not disclose or suggest calculating a buffer occupancy accumulator. No agreement was reached regarding claim 1, however Examiner Werner stated that he would re-evaluate Lee in light of Applicants' representatives' arguments.

Several dependent claims were also discussed during the interview. For instance, Applicants' representatives discussed dependent claims 3, 4, 7, and 8. With respect to dependent claims 3, Examiner Werner agreed that the cited section of Chiang that discusses reducing the number of transmitted bits is not the same as clipping a buffer occupancy accumulator. With respect to claim 4, Examiner Werner agreed that the cited section of Chiang discussing a scaling factor for a quantizer is not the same as scaling a buffer occupancy accumulator. Examiner Werner asked for clarification of clipping and scaling the buffer occupancy accumulator. Applicants' representatives agreed to amend dependent claims 3 and 4 to further clarify clipping and scaling of the buffer occupancy accumulator.

With respect to dependent claims 7 and 8, Applicants' representatives discussed that the cited section of Peak discloses macroblock classifications based on color and luminance signals. Examiner Werner agreed that macroblock classification based on color and luminance signals is not the same as a scaling function that is a function of the position of a macroblock or the bits per pixel of a particular frame. Examiner Werner agreed that claims 7 and 8 are not found in the cited references and that claim 7 is stronger than claim 8.

Applicants thank Examiner Werner for the telephonic interview. Applicants' statement of the substance of the interview is being timely submitted within one month of the interview.

Respectfully submitted,

ADELI & TOLLEN LLP

Dated: September 4, 2009

/Palak Bhakta/

Palak Bhakta

Reg. No. 60,501

Adeli & Tollen LLP
1875 Century Park East, Suite 1360
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Phone: (310) 785-0140 x313
Fax: (310) 785-9558